Remarks

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 2-10, 12-22 and 24-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 21, 22, and 24 are the independent claims.

Claim 21 has been amended merely to improve its idiomatic form.

Claim 23 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12, 13, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0210771 (*Wood et al.*). Claims 4-6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over wood in view of U.S. patent Publication No. 2003/0051026 (*Carter et al.*). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 22 continues to recite, *inter alia*, wherein said sequence of processes includes operations carried out in the operating system of the server.

Independent claim 21 continues to recite, *inter alia*, wherein the server operates the processes in the sequence of processes according to the authorization level associated with the session identification code.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wood et al. does not teach at least the aforementioned claim features, for at least the following reasons. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Wood et al.* and *Carter et al.* fails to disclose all of the features of the dependent claims.

Request for consideration of claims IN THEIR ENTIRETIES

A review of the Final Office Action mailed 1/21/2010 reveals that the Office did not address either of the aforementioned claim features. Indeed, a review of pages 3-6 of the Office Action shows an attempt to group all of the independent claims into a single paragraph that extends for 3 pages to facilitate an omnibus

rejection. That omnibus rejection, however, is silent as to the aforementioned claim features. In this way, the Office has failed to satisfy the obligations of MPEP § 2143.03.

Consequently, in the event that the Office maintains the rejection of independent claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicants respectfully request that the Office, in the interests of compact prosecution, identify on the record and with specificity sufficient to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation, where in the *Woods et al.* patent the aforementioned claim features are alleged to be taught.

Introductory comments

The examiner relates to the claim term "process" to the term "interaction" in *Wood et al.* In *Wood et al.*, the term “interaction” is used to describe access requests of a client entity to an information security system. For example, Wood et al. explains that "*In one utilization, session tokens are issued to client entities as part of* ***an interaction with the security architecture*** *and are thereafter presented with* ***access requests***" (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0045]). The interaction is limited only to session between the requesting entity and the information security information system.

The claims as presented variously recite to the process operations which are a carried out at the operating system of the server. These operations are internal processes of the operating system, having no interaction with external entities. A novel aspect of the present invention as claimed is the ability to maintain the session ID between an external session that relates to interaction with external entities and operations at the operating system level. *Wood et al.* limits the continuity only to interaction between the external entity and security information system, stating in paragraph [0045], that "[s]ession continuity means the maintenance of coherent session state across one or more interactions between an entity and an information environment".

Independent claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the cited art

At page 3 the examiner cites the following sentence "providing a persistent session in a networked information environment includes associating a unique session identifier with a **set of access requests originating from a client entity** and maintaining the unique session identifier across a credential level change" (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0011]). This sentence exemplifies that the unique session identifier is maintained only through the interaction of access request between a client entity and information system, not relating to the process initiated by the access request and carried out in operating system of the information system.

The Office further cites " *In general, a wide variety of entities, including c users operating browser and/or non-browser client applications as well as automated agents and systems, may interact with enterprise applications and/or resources 190 and the security architecture as described herein."* (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0041]). This paragraph describes the type of entities which can interact with information security system according to *Wood et al.*; all these types of entities are external to the information security system. According to claims 22 and 21 as presently presented, at least some of the processes are internal operations running within the server at the operating system level.

The Office Action states at page 7 that "Wood, discloses producing structure of hierarchical processes at the kernel level" citing paragraph [0045]. A review of this cited paragraph or at any other paragraph, however, reveals no the use of the term Kernel or operating system appears. Also, *Wood et al.* does not teach "hierarchical processes". Here, it is important to note that the Office's interpretation of "subsequent interactions", as "child process" in hierarchical tree is inaccurate, each node of an hierarchal tree may have more than one child, but "subsequent interactions" only implies of sequential structure.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 24

Claims 24 recites " associating the session identification code of the communication session at least to a child process, said child process been created by a process operated by the communication session". *Wood et al.* is silent regarding "child process", however, and the Office's interpretation of "subsequent interactions", as "child process" in hierarchical tree is inaccurate, since each node of an hierarchal tree may have more than one child, but "subsequent interactions" only implies of sequential structure.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 24 is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are patentably for reasons other than their base claims

Each of claims 2-10 and 12 to 20 and 25-28 depend, directly on indirectly, from claim 21, 22 or 24 discussed above, and thus is patentable at least for the virtue of being dependent on a patentable base claim. Nevertheless, the applicant discusses the patentability of some of the dependent claims independently of the patentability of the base claims.

Claims 3 and 13 continue to recite at least one agent installed on the at least one server, the agent enabling correlating between processes and sessions on different servers. The Office contends that *Wood et al.*'s teaching that a gatekeeper and entry handler component 110 provides an entry point for **external client** applications **requesting access** to enterprise applications and/or resources 190, including e.g., information resources 191, 192 . . . 193, for which access management is provided by the security architecture at paragraph [0033] anticipates this claim feature. This explanation in *Wood et al.*, however, relates only to access requests of external clients to multiple enterprise application and not correlating between processes on different servers, which refers to interaction in between the servers of processes running in the operating systems of servers. Absent is any teaching of correlating between processes and sessions on different servers. Applicants respectfully submit that this is another reason for which claim 14 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 14 recites the following feature: "the association of the session identification code to the additional process comprises adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector".

The Office acknowledges that the aforementioned feature is not disclosed by *Wood et al.* Nonetheless, the Office contends that paragraph [0432] of *Carter et al.* discloses this feature. The applicants respectfully disagree.

Carter et al. states "[o]nce the PIDs have been identified and placed within a Process Identification Matrix", the PID is stored at the matrix and not in the vector. *Carter et al.* further disclosse in this paragraph that "[t]**he Process Identification Vector** selects the PIDs by **using the Process Identification Vector** to identify the associated UID **in building a User Control Matrix of UIDs**", although this sentence is logically inaccurate (the process vector uses its self) its clear the PID ("parent process ids") is not contained within the vector but requires to build **a User Control Matrix of UIDs**. This matrix is a central information source for all users and processes not part of the process information. The table in paragraph [0363] shows clearly that the PID parameter is stored at the matrix.

Thus, *Carter et al.* does not disclose *adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector*, as recited in claim 14. Rather, in *Carter et al.*, the identification of the parent process id (PID) is not inherited from the parent process and not added to the process vector, the identification is retrieved from a general file ("filename file") and stored in an identification matrix: "*A process read routine strips away all **process ids (PIDs) and parent process ids (PPIDs) from the filename file along with the user information**, such as the UID--the owner of each process--from the filename file. Another process called matrix generation **generates the process identification matrix from the information stored in the filename file***."(*Carter et al.*, paragraph [0340]).

Applicants respectfully submit that this is another reason for which claim 14 is patentable over the cited art.

The Claim 4 contains the aforementioned feature, in language pertaining to system. The applicant respectfully submits that this is another reason for which claim 4 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 5 and 15 contain the following feature: "the session identification code replaces redundant information in the process information vector". The Examiner did not consider this limitation for the second time; therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness was presented against claim 5 or against claim 15 (see MPEP § 2143.03).

Claim 25 recites " producing a hierarchical structure of processes at the kernel level", wood is silent regarding " hierarchical structure of processes" and does not disclose any process running on the kernel level.(operating system level)

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael Kondoudis/

Michael Kondoudis
Reg. No. 42, 758

The Law Office
of Michael E. Kondoudis
888 16th Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
202-349-9850